

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Rea. 1450
27112-1450

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,933	12/28/2001	Richard E. Smalley	11321-P012WOUS	9922
7590 01/05/2004			EXAMINER	
ROBERT C. SHADDOX			HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK, P.C.				
910 TRAVIS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2400			1754	
HOUSTON, TX 77002				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Application No. Applicant(s) Office Action Summary Group Art I bit -The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address-Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication . - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133). Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on ☐ This action is FINAL. ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quavle, 1935 C.D. 1 1: 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims \_\_\_\_is/are pending in the application. Of the above claim(s)\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s)\_\_\_ is/are allowed. X Claim(s)\_ is/are rejected. ☐ Claim(s)\_\_\_ \_\_ is/are objected to. \_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement. Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on\_\_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved. ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)). \*Certified copies not received:\_ Attachment(s) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s), ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Part of Paper No.

□ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Other

Office Action Summary

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim 165 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Tohji article.

Tohji teaches on pg. 1975 purification of SWNTs in hot oxidant. The presence of torroids is deemed inherent, as a variety of carbon species are synthesized when nanotubes are made

Claims 1-17, 163-164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tohji article taken with Bandow et al. and/or Bonard et al.

Tohji teaches on pg. 1975 purification of SWNTs in hot oxidant. This does not teach a surfactant, however Bandow/Bonard teach purifying nanotubes with a surfactant such as SDS. Using both purification techniques is an obvious expedient to gain the effect of both, to make very pure nanotubes. See In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069 and Ex Parte Novak 16 USPQ 2d 2043

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754